## **Environmental Checklist Form**

1. Project title: General Waste Discharge Requirements for Residential Onsite Wastewater
Treatment Systems

2. Lead agency name and address: <u>California Regional Water Quality Control Board</u>,

Los Angeles Region

320 West 4<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 200 Los Angeles, CA 90013

Contact person and phone number: Jenny Newman

California Regional Water Quality Control Board,

Los Angeles Region (213) 576-6808

4. Project location: Los Angeles and Ventura Counties

5. Project sponsor's name and address: N/A

6. General plan designation: <u>Residential</u> 7. Zoning: <u>Residential</u>

8. Description of project:

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region (Regional Board) has drafted an Order containing general waste discharge requirements (WDRs) for the discharge to land of wastewater from residential onsite wastewater treatment systems. Under the California Water Code, the Regional Board may adopt general WDRs for a category of discharges produced by similar operations, involving similar types of waste and treatment standards, and that are more appropriately regulated under general WDRs than individual discharge requirements. Discharges to land of wastewater from residential onsite wastewater treatment systems satisfy these criteria. The proposed general WDRs contain provisions and requirements that will protect the beneficial uses of ground and surface waters in the Region. The discharge of waste from residential onsite wastewater treatment systems poses a potential significant environmental risk to water quality and public health. These general WDRs, however, mitigate these potential risks to a level of insignificance. Discharges would have to meet any applicable criteria in the Basin Plan for the protection of beneficial uses as will as the requirements of the proposed Order. In addition, only residential type wastewater is allowed under the general WDRs so that the threat from more toxic constituents is non-existent. Based upon the information contained in the Environmental Checklist, the Regional Board finds that the discharge of waste from residential onsite wastewater treatment systems will not result in a significant effect on the environment, provided that the discharger complies with the terms of the proposed Order.

- 9. Surrounding land uses and setting: Briefly describe the project's surroundings: The proposed project applies to single family residences in Los Angeles and Ventura Counties.
- 10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)  $\underline{N/A}$

## ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

	vironmental factors checked ist on the following pages.	below	would be potentially affected	by this	project, as indicated by the
	Aesthetics		Agriculture Resources	X	Air Quality
X	Biological Resources		Cultural Resources	X	Geology /Soils
	Hazards & Hazardous Materials	X	Hydrology / Water Quality		Land Use / Planning
	Mineral Resources		Noise		Population / Housing
	Public Services		Recreation		Transportation/Traffic
X	Utilities / Service Systems		Mandatory Findings of Sign	ificanc	ee
DETE	RMINATION:				
On the	basis of this initial evaluation	n:			
	I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.				
X	there will not be a signific	ant eff	project could have a significa ect in this case because revision oponent. A MITIGATED NEC	ns in t	he project have been made
	I find that the proposed pr ENVIRONMENTAL IMP		MAY have a significant effect REPORT is required.	on the	environment, and an
	significant unless mitigate adequately analyzed in an been addressed by mitigat	d" imp earlier ion me NTAL	MAY have a "potentially signifact on the environment, but at document pursuant to applica easures based on the earlier an IMPACT REPORT is required.	least of ble leg alysis	one effect 1) has been gal standards, and 2) has as described on attached
□	I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.				
<u>Origi</u> Signa	inal Signed by Paula Rasmus. Iture	sen			<i>March</i> 29, 2004 Date

## DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION:

III.e. Would the project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. The discharge of residential type wastewater to land has the potential to create objectionable odors. However, no odors will be perceivable if the discharger complies with the following provisions of the proposed general WDRs:

- D.3. The surfacing or overflow of sewage from the residential onsite wastewater treatment system at any time and at any location is prohibited.
- E.3. Odors of sewage origin shall not be detectable.
- IV.a. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. The discharge of residential type wastewater to land, where groundwater is in hydraulic connection with nearby surface waters, has the potential to impact surface water quality and therefore species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status. However, no impact will occur if dischargers comply with the following provisions in the proposed general WDRs:

E.1. Dischargers covered under this Order shall comply with all applicable Basin Plan provisions, including any prohibitions and water quality objectives governing onsite wastewater treatment systems.

In addition, discharges defined as medium and high risk to ground and surface water quality shall comply with the inspection and reporting requirements of part F to ensure the proper functioning of the onsite wastewater treatment systems and protection of ground and surface water quality. Furthermore, discharges defined as high-risk shall comply with receiving water monitoring and reporting requirements of part G to ensure protection of ground and surface water quality.

IV.b. Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. See explanation for IV.a.

VI.e. Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. The discharge of residential type wastewater to land has the potential to have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of onsite wastewater treatment systems. However, no systems will be used in unsuitable soils if dischargers comply with the following provisions of the proposed general WDRs:

- E.1. Dischargers covered under this Order shall comply with all applicable Basin Plan provisions, including any prohibitions and water quality objectives governing onsite wastewater treatment systems.
- E.6. No part of the disposal system(s) shall extend to a depth where waste may pollute groundwater.
- E.12. This Order does not relieve the discharger from responsibility to obtain other necessary local, State, and Federal permits to construct facilities necessary for compliance with this Order, nor does this Order prevent imposition of additional standards, requirements, or conditions by any other regulatory agency.
- VIII.a. Wound the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. The discharge of residential type wastewater to land has the potential to violate any water quality standard or waste discharge requirement. However, no water quality standards will be violated if dischargers comply with the following provisions of the proposed general WDRs:

- E.1. Dischargers covered under this Order shall comply with all applicable Basin Plan provisions, including any prohibitions and water quality objectives governing onsite wastewater treatment systems.
- E.6. No part of the disposal system(s) shall extend to a depth where waste may pollute groundwater.

In addition, discharges defined as medium and high risk to ground and surface water quality shall comply with the inspection and reporting requirements of part F to ensure the proper functioning of the onsite wastewater treatment systems and protection of ground and surface water quality. Furthermore, discharges defined as high-risk shall comply with receiving water monitoring and reporting requirements of part G to ensure protection of ground and surface water quality.

VIII.f. Would the project otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated. See explanation for VIII.a.

XVI.b. Would the project require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

Less Than Significant Impact. Compliance with the requirements of the proposed general WDRs may require dischargers defined as high-risk to install advanced treatment systems. However, the number of onsite wastewater treatment systems requiring advanced treatment will be a small fraction of the number of systems potentially covered by the proposed general WDRs.

## **EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

Issues:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
I. AESTHETICS Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?				X
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?				<b>8</b> 7
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?				X
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	□			X
II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	□			<b>X</b> I
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?				
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?				X

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
III. AIR QUALITY Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:				
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?				X
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?				<b>X</b> I
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?				团
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				<b>⋉</b> ]
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?		Ø		
IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES Would the project:				
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?		<b>X</b> I		
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	□	<b>⊠</b>		□

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	□			X
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	□			X
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?				X
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				<b>*</b> ]
V. CULTURAL RESOURCES Would the project:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in '15064.5?				X
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to '15064.5?				X
c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?				X
d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?				X
VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS Would the project:				
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.		□		Ø
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?				×
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?				
iv) Landslides?		□		X
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?				$\nabla$
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in onor off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?				X
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?				鬥
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?		<b>X</b> I		0
VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS B Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?				
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?				Ø

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	□			<b>⊠</b> I
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?		□		×
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				Ø
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?				<b>⊠</b>
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?				X
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?				<b>⊠</b>
VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY Would the project:				
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?		<b>⊠</b>		
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of preexisting nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?		□		

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	□			X
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?				<b>X</b>
e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?				×
f) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?		X		
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?				<b>⊠</b> I
h) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?				<b>⋈</b>
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?				×
j) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?				
IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING - Would the project:				
a) Physically divide an established community?				X
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?				Ŋ

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?				X
X. MINERAL RESOURCES Would the project:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	□			Ø
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally- important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?				×
XI. NOISE B Would the project result in:				
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?				×
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?		□		X
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	□			
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	□			
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	□			Ø
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?				×
XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING Would the project:				

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impac
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	□			X
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				×
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				×
XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES				
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?				$\mathbf{x}$
Police protection?				X
Schools?				X
Parks?				X
Other public facilities?				
XIV. RECREATION				
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?				<b>X</b> ]
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?				Ø

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC Would the project:				
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?				Ş
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	□	□		
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	□	□		Ø
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?				X
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?				X
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?				$\nabla$
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?				Ø
XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS B Would the project:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?				X
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?			X	□

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	□	□		X
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?		□	0	Ø
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project=s projected demand in addition to the provider=s existing commitments?	□	□		
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project=s solid waste disposal needs?				Ø
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?				X
XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?				<b>X</b> I
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?				X
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?				Ø